

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 11, 16-20 and 22-25 were pending and rejected. In this response, claim 20 has been cancelled herein. Claims 1, 5, 11, 16, 17, 19 and 22-25 have been amended herein. Claims 34-40 have been added. No new matters have been introduced. Claims 1-5, 11, 16-19, 22-25 and 34-40 are now pending. Entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-5, 11, 16-20 and 22, 23 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flurry (U.S. Pat. No 5,684,968) in view of McKenny (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,241). “To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Claim 20 has been cancelled, without prejudice.

For the purposes of clarification, independent claims 1, 16, and 22 have been amended to clarify that two copies are made (“a copy of the selected subset of an entire image” and “a copy of the processed image”) and stored in a buffer. First, the “copy of the subset” is in “a buffer in a main memory” prior to performing an intensive operations (“CPU intensive operations” in claim 1, “computing intensive processing” in claim 16, and “encoding operation” in claim 22) (see Page 8 of the Specification, lines 3-4 of second full paragraph and Abstract for antecedent basis). Second, the “copy of the processed image” is copied from the main memory after being stored in the buffer (see Page 8 of Specification, third full paragraph, and Abstract). Additionally, the encoding and decoding operations recited in independent claim 22 have antecedent basis in FIGS. 3B and 3C of the Specification, along with the Figures’ descriptions on Page 8, second and third full paragraphs.

1. No teaching of making a “copy of a subset of an entire image” as recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 22

Independent claims 1, 16 and 22 have been amended to recite making a “copy of a subset of an entire image”, which is achieved by the previously recited “multiple calls to a memory copy function copying each image line of the selected subset”. This technique of copying only a subset of the entire image and its advantages has antecedent basis in the Specification beginning on Page 9, after the title “FIG. 4-Preferred Embodiment”, and extending through Page 12.

None of the references, either singly or in combination, disclose making a copy of a “subset of the entire image” from an I/O RAM memory (claims 1 and 16) or a capture video RAM (claim 22) for further processing by the processor. To the contrary, Flurry teaches transfers of the entire image, as the Examiner pointed out, with reference to step 1425 in FIG. 14 “Copy Captured Image to User Buffer” (column 11, lines 23-31). McKenny does not process image data, instead it processes general data in “four 32-bit words” (column 5, line 29). New dependent claims 36, 38 and 40 further define the subset of the entire image.

2. No teaching of “multiple calls to a memory copy function copying/to copy each image line of the selected subset” as recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 22

With respect to independent claims 1, 16, and 22, none of the references, either singly or in combination, disclose “multiple calls to a memory copy function copying/to copy each image line of the selected subset”, which allows for the transfer of the selected subset of the entire image instead of the entire image (See Page 8, first paragraph after title Fig 4-Preferred Embodiment of the Specification). To the contrary, McKenny uses data bursting to allow “32-bit words of memory to be transferred in response to a single read or write request” and is not involved with image transfers (column 5, lines 28-31).

3. No teaching of making intensive operations as recited in independent claims 1, 16, and 22

With respect to claim recitations of performing intensive operations (“CPU intensive operations” in claim 1, “computing intensive processing” in claim 16, and “encoding operation” in claim 22) on the copy of the selected subset” in independent claims 1, 16 and 22, Flurry does not teach such intensive operations. The extent of the teachings in Flurry is

described in Column 3, lines 6-9) where it is stated that “The application can get each image into system memory so that it can perform further processing on the image...”, without Flurry specifying what “further processing” includes. Dependent claims 19, 24, 25 and 34 define these intensive operations in more detail.

4. No teaching of using “cache memory” in performing intensive operations as recited in new dependent claims 35, 37, and 39

New dependent claims 35, 37 and 39 recite “the main memory includes cache memory to store the selected subset of the entire image and the processed image” (See page 7, Paragraph after title “Processing Speed Improvement-FIGS. 3A to 3C of Specification). Hence, the in intense operations (“CPU intensive operations” in claim 1, “computing intensive processing” in claim 16, and “encoding operation” in claim 22) are performed with the selected subset being in cache memory. Likewise, the “processed image” recited in claims 1, 16, and 22 is stored in case memory. To the contrary, as shown in FIG. 3 of Flurry, in the “I/O data being transferred from I/O memory A 101 to I/O memory B 103” (column 6, lines 16-17) using source locations 210 and destination locations 211 in cache memory, the I/O data is not subjected to such intense operations, but is merely transferred to and from locations 210 and 211 (column 6, lines 32-47).

In summary, the references, singly or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 16, and 22 as required under M.P.E.P. § 2131. Accordingly, Applicants request that the instant §103 rejections of claims 1, 16 and 22 be withdrawn.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flurry (U.S. Pat. No. 5,684,968) in view of McKenny (U.S. Pat. No. 6,230,241) and in further view of Cullen et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,592,629). Since Cullen does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of Flurry and McKenny, and claim 24 is dependent from independent claim 22, claim 24 is allowable for at least the reasons described with respect to independent claim 22.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe the applicable rejections have been overcome and all claims remaining in the application are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable consideration and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, if additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at 206-381-8819. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,  
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: August 10, 2009

by: /Al AuYeung/

Al AuYeung  
Reg. No.: 35,432

U.S. Bank Centre  
1420 5th Avenue, Suite 3010  
Seattle, WA 98101  
Phone 206-622-1711